DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 226 659 HE 015 927

AUTHOR Kahn, Ethel D.
TITLE The Psycho-Social Dimensions of the Equity Struggle in Academe.
PUB DATE 82
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association (Washington, DC, August 23-27, 1982).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Age Discrimination; *College Faculty; *Emotional Experience; *Employment Practices; *Faculty College Relationship; *Grievance Procedures; Higher Education; Interprofessional Relationship; Personnel Policy; Psychological Patterns; Sex Discrimination; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Dismissal; Teacher Employment; Tenure
IDENTIFIERS Faculty Reappointment

ABSTRACT

The psychosocial dimensions of filing grievances in academia were studied, along with faculty members' views of the experience, factors contributing to success or failure, the effect of age and sex, and effectiveness in achieving sex equity. Questionnaire responses were obtained from 41 grievants at a major eastern university. Fifty-four percent were male and 46 percent female; 44 percent were between 40 and 50 years old, 29.3 percent were below 40, and 27 percent were over 50. All of the cases pertained to procedures for reappointment or tenure. Respondents rated the support they received from immediate family, male and female colleagues, friends, and the faculty organization. Using a 14-item semantic differential, respondents selected between bipolar adjectives that best expressed their feelings about themselves during the grievance. It was found that filing a grievance is a isolating process that brings little support from colleagues, and that grievants pay a very high price psychologically and professionally, particularly during the grievance process, and the trauma often continues for some time. Only 26.8 percent of the females claimed minority status as women, although 39.1 percent identified sex discrimination as an issue in their grievance. Comments of respondents are included. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED226659

THE PSYCHO-SOCIAL DIMENSIONS OF THE EQUITY STRUGGLE in Academe

Ethel D. Kahn, Ph.D.
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, N.J. 08903
U.S.A.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ethel D Kahn

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Presented at the 1982
American Psychological Association

HE 015 927

© All rights reserved. No copies may be made. Any use of this material must give full citation to the author.

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL IMPACT OF THE GRIEVANCE PROCESS AS IT RELATES TO SEX EQUITY AND OTHER ISSUES

INTRODUCTION

When Congress passed Title IX of the 1972 amendments to the Education Law, it set in motion a comprehensive effort to eradicate discrimination on the basis of sex from all educational institutions that receive Federal assistance. Considered by many to be a major factor in the advancement of women albeit only modest gains, its future is uncertain as it faces re-evaluation under the Reagan Administration.

Under its aegis women in academia have sought to achieve sex equity. The most recent report on that struggle maintains that much remains undone and in particular, that progress for women employed in education has been minimal. (NACWEP, p. 37).

It would seem to those outside the academic setting that it is the most likely setting in which sex equity could be achieved. This might be so for many reasons. First, it is in academia that criteria defining "merit" have long been used. These are designed to guide appointments, tenure and promotion. Secondly, women have been attaining graduate degrees in substantial and increasing numbers over the past few decades. This means that there is an ample supply of qualified female candidates in many disciplines, albeit not all. This provides an ample skills pool for appointments leading to tenure and promotion. Third, some would expect that there might be some correlation between education achievement and rational decision making with regard to appointments, promotions and tenure of women given that such decisions are made by tenured professors and that such an educated group would decide on the basis of qualifications rather than sex. Fourth, one would also assume that women in academia, having arrived at that level of achievement, would be more androgynous and able to protect and promote their professional entitlements.

The author makes none of these assumptions. In fact, the Chronicle of Higher Education (1976) has reported consistent, continuing and even increasing disparities in salary, rank and tenure between males and females in higher education. Many within academia point to the influence of the "old boys"network, the higher status, role and position accorded the so called male disciplines over the female disciplines and women's studies, the male mentor system that transfers attributes of the senior male professor to his junior

malecolleagues or doctoral students, the male-dominated administration and grievance process and stereotypic notions about women. Often "merit" is a code word for cronyism as junior male faculty are evaluated on there "potential" and narratures and ratings can emphasize strengths and weaknesses differentially.

In the arena of individualism and academic freedom, idiosyncratic appointment and salary negotiation have neen nurtured for too long, often to the disadvantage of people who are not sufficiently knowledgeable about their worth, and inexperienced in negotiating about themselves. Over the past decade we have seen the beginnings of collective bargaining, pressure to accept the standards of the American Association of University Professors and greater specificity in the use of the peer review process and collegial recommendations. Despite this women are required to carry on their struggle for sex equity within their institutions, in State and Federal Civil Rights agencies and through the courts.

Charging 250 institutions of higher education with Title VII violations in its first year of existence, women have continued the struggle to redress sex discrimination, although with limited success.

Sex stereotypic notions frequently preclude extensive action by women requiring as it does the filing of charges and the pursuit of an adversarial role vis a vis colleagues and administration. Women typically socialized as nurturers and compromisers averse to conflict and assertiveness find themselves in a situation requiring assertion of one's self worth and a challenge to male authority. They are unwilling to recognize discrimination when it is shown discrimination manifests itself in the academic setting. Yet the incidence of sex discrimination continues and the issue is joined -- but in no way to the extent statistical data with regard to sex differences in rank, salary, and tenure would presume.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A review of the literature confirms that research on the sex equity struggle has not been extensive. This probably has 3 bases; 1) it is painful to confront, 2) settlements require confidentiality, and 3) it is not considered legitimate as research where tenure and promotion decisions are being made. A monthly update reports on complaints and court decisions, local agency decisions, and legislation of federal regulations in the field of equal opportunity. (EEN,Nor. 1980).

The women in the study were better educated than the average working woman. Their complaints centered on unequal pay (46%); unequal "conditions" (42%); inability to obtain training (10%); sex-based termination (8%); discriminatory refusal of a job (7%). The study reported that 90% of the time the complainant gained some relief and 75% said they would make the same decision again if confronted by the same situation. Thirty-one percent reported informal support from coworkers; but 46% received a negative reaction and 3% were treated with open hostility. Predominantly the complainants felt that filing theircomplaint was worthwhile if they had the support of middle managers and/or if they changed management attitudes. "They were not influenced by the presence or absence of support either from top management of from their families, nor were they influenced by the possibility of employer retaliation or the possibility of obtaining or losing a promotion as a result of the complaint." (EEN, November, 1980). Although faculty women were probably included in this sample, no specific data regarding their cases were reported.

Despite some significant victories for faculty women in the courts, a review of female plaintiffs in academic employment concludes that the "predominantly male judiciary does not view their claims sympathetically, and finds it easy to defer to the credentials, if not the expertise, of university "decision-makers." (Vladeck and Young, 1978). Thus the courts legitimize decision-makers within the academic community, the unique peer process, as of greater significance than criteria for fair employment practices affecting women in other work place situations.

Filing grievances in academia frequently means bringing charges against your peers, your professional colleagues, the very community of scholars from whom, in part, you have acquired identity and with whom you will have to interact if you succeed. The grapevine bears many personal stories about this process. In an attempt to determine the validity of this anecdotal data a pilot study was undertaken of faculty grievants. It explores the psycho-social impact of the grievance experience. Are there differences in the experience for men and women? A gender specific framework would suggest that women are more sensitive and fragile and therefore more vulnerable to the difficulties of the experience. The study also explored the following questions:

1) What are the factors that contribute to success or failure in a grievance?
2) How does faculty regard the experience?
3) Is the grievance process a constructive or destructive one?
4) Are age and sex critical variables?

5) Is the grievance process a viable route for the achievement of sex equity?

METHODOLOGY

The study was conducted at a major Eastern university in the United States with the cooperation of the grievance committee of the faculty bargaining agent. The University has established grievance procedures to resolve issues arising out of reappointment, promotion, tenure and working conditions. The faculty bargaining agent offers support, provides experienced counselors, many of whom are on the law school faculty, and monitors the grievance cases.

A six page questionnaire designed to tap the nature of the grievance experience and its impact on the grievant was sent to all those who had filed grievances over the past ten years along with General Personal and Institutional Data. It is grouped into such aspects as Characteristics of the Grievance, Reactions of Self and Others, and the Effects of the Grievance Experience.

In addition to demographic data, the questionnaire asked for information on the thoughts and feelings of the grievant both during the grievance and after by means of a semantic differential. Respondents were also asked to identify factors contributing to the success or failure of their grievance, their perception of the degree of support obtained from colleagues, friends and family, and their assessment of the psycho-social, physical and financial costs of the experience. The questionnaire was pre-tested and reviewed by grievance committee leaders for face validity and inclusiveness.

Both male and female grievants were included to provide data on possible differential responses. Where quantitative data was requested, an open-ended question to explain the response was also provided.

There were 287 grievants in the 10 year period, of whom 72 were not reachable. Of the 215 cases, twenty percent returned the questionnaireon the first mailing. The follow-up mailing has not been completed. This is, therefore, a preliminary report on the data to date.

FINDINGS

Personal Data

In this sample, 54% of the respondents were male and 46% female. Two-thirds of the sample teach at the undergraduate level. Forty-four percent are

between 40 and 50 years of age with 29.3% below 40 and 27% over 50.

More than half of the faculty responding were married (56%); 17.1% were either separated or divorced and 19.5% were single. Half of the respondents had been at the University for 10 years or more with some having been employed there more than 20 years.

The Grievance

All of the cases grew out of procedures relating to reappointment or tenure. When asked to indicate the issues in the grievance, violation of the University's procedures and due process were most frequently reported. Table 1 reports the data on the grievance issues. In a sample population that is 46% women, note that sex discrimination was reported by only 39% . In a question inquiring as to their claim of minority status an even smaller number, 26.8%, responded that they had claimed minority status as women.

Table 1

Issues in the Grievance by Percent of Faculty Reporting (N=41)

Issue	Percent Reporting
Violation of Procedures	73.2
Personal Prejudice	58.5
Personality Conflicts	48.8
Sex Descrimination	39.1
Academic Discipline	36.0
Age	14.7
Race	14.7

In 51% of the cases, the University had an attorney carrying the case but only 20% of the grievants reported such representation. More than half the sample, equally divided between men and women, was successful (53.7%). This includes 4.9% who reported partial success. This high rate of success was probably due to the sampling process which has not yet followed up most of those who were not reached because they have left the University. About a quarter (24.4%) were unsuccessful with the balance reporting their cases as still pending.

As to the factors that could or did contribute to success, most of the grievants who responded ranked their own perseverance as most significant (89.7%) and effective representation as the next (82.2%). Representation refers to both counselors and attorneys. Faculty support (67.8%) and family support (61.6%0 were also recognized as important contributions to success with only 38.4% repcrting the contribution of their dean.

Reactions of Self and Others

Deciding to file a grievance is a complex and difficult decision to make. For academics, accustomed to the relative isolation and independence of teaching and research, the grievance decision is an enormous one. The decision to file publically challenges the central administration, which although often many layers removed from a faculty position, involves the grievants' values with regard to challenging authority. This requires a strong belief in the rightness of the cause and a belief in the odds the candidate will prevail against the power of the administration. In addition the scarcity of other jobs may play a role in mobilizing the person to action. In fields such as the humanities, the denial of tenure may be the first step to a major change in career direction. In a field like business or computer science, the number of alternatives may make a grievance irrelevant or superfluous.

But another even more difficult aspect of the decision comes from the fact that it challenges peers and colleagues, professional mentors, and the dean with whom there may be strong interpersonal ties and with whom a continuing relationship is often necessary. Finally friends and family have something to say as well and must be convinced.

Thus, grievants are plagued by these issues: Can I challenge the system? Will anyone help me? Will I be seen as needlessly rocking the boat? Maybe I can wait until next year (for those for whom the issue is not up or out). If I'm not wanted here maybe I'll find something else, and How, indeed can I challenge academic judgement? The uncertainty of how others will react is very threatening, since their support is condidered by the grievant as crucial to his/her self-image, regardless of success. For some, pride is involved and fears of evaluation and criticism.

This study attempted to assess the degree of support that grievants felt they received from those around them once they made the decision to grieve. There were two questions involved. Support was conceptualized as being either

privately or publicly given. Family and friends might give a great deal of support privately, in the form of being a sounding board, providing encouragement and confirming of the rightness of the cause, etc., yet not be in a position to contribute publicly. On the other hand, colleagues may give private, personal support but have the option, which not all take, of also offering public support through testimony, statements at faculty meetings, or just the willingness to stand up and be counted. Respondents were asked to rate the support they received from each group: (0) not al all, (1) very little, (2) moderate, (3) high and (4) very high. Table 2 describes the data. Ratings were to reflect their perception of the majority of those in each group.

Table 2

Faculty Perceptions of Support

Source of Support	Percent Responding					
	None	Little to Moderate	High Vy. High	None	Little to Moderate	High Vy. High
Immediate Family	5.1	12.8	82 0	24.1	17.2	58.6
Male Colleagues	18.4	47.4	34.3	25.0	50.0	25.0
Female Colleagues	23.7	36.9	39.5	22.2	31.6	33.3
Friends	2.4	21.9	75.7	18.4	29.0	52.7
Faculty Organization	5.0	22.5	72.5	10.3	33.4	56.4

The appendix Tables A1 to A20 report the perceived support by age and sex. There is a significant difference indicated in some dimensions when the support is analyzed by age of the grievant.

On all of the above measures, responses of males and females were compared. Chi squares and T tests determined that there was no significant differences between the responses of men and women faculty on their perception of support from all groups but one. Men see stronger support from the faculty organization than do women, with the difference significant at the .05 level. On all other

dimensions, there was no significant difference, although women consistently reported feeling greater support from their families than men. When the data are analyzed by age, men in the 40-50 age group receive significantly higher support from their families ($P<.03$) and from their friends ($P<.003$ private support, $P<.04$ public support).

What stands out is that colleagues, both male and female were not seen as supportive either publicly or privately. This may be due to their fears for their own careers, and is an effective means for keeping people in line.

When a composite score for each respondent was calculated for the perception of private and public support, half rated private support as high to very high in contrast to less than a third who saw public support in that way. While private support is better than none, this can serve to reinforce the grievant's sense of self-doubt and isolation.

Impact on the Grievant

Several sets of questions sought to establish how much discomfort is experienced during the grievance process. A 14 item semantic differential asked respondents to select between the bipolar adjectives that best expressed how they felt about themselves during the grievance. The data indicated strong feelings of being disturbed, unhappy, bitter, vindictive and angry.

The data on how respondents felt after the grievance shows continued negative feelings of anger, of having been violated and cheated but with more movement toward feeling proud and valuable.

Another dimension of comfort/discomfort was reflected in the extent of the negative response to how likely grievants were to discuss their grievance with students (48.8%), individual faculty (29.3%), women's groups (63.4%), men's groups (65.9%), at faculty meetings (70.7%) and at social gatherings (46.3%).

It seems that the traditional isolation of faculty is confirmed by the reluctance to discuss their issues other than on an individual basis with colleagues. Thirty-four percent of the respondents believed that others doubted their merit because of their grievance. Although less than half of those who were successful felt that they openly take pride in their success, seventy-eight percent would file again if they had to do it over. While this is more true for men than for women, the difference is not significant. Only 5% of the respondents would advise others not to file a grievance, and again there is no sex difference.

Respondents were asked to rate what price they paid in personal and professional terms for participation in the grievance process. Table 3 reports the percent responding on five dimensions, the psychological, social, physical, financial and professional costs. The financial cost was the least burdensome in contrast to the high psychological and professional price paid for the experience, possibly because AAUP counseling is volunteered. More than half the respondents saw the financial cost as very small. The greatest number of respondents (65.9%) reported significant psychological costs and more than half (51.2%) saw the impact on their professional life as extensive. Physical and social strain are also apparent.

Table 3

Percent of Faculty Reporting the Cost of Carrying Out A Grievance Case

Category	Percent of Faculty Reporting		
	Minimal to Low Cost	Medium Cost	Significant to Very High Cost
Psychological	17.1	17.1	65.9
Social	48.8	19.5	31.7
Physical	43.9	22.0	34.2
Financial	53.7	9.8	36.6
Professional	42.5	4.9	51.2

In addition to the rating, respondents explained their ratings in the following positive and negative terms.

Fighting with my colleagues left a bitter feeling.

At one point in the midst of this, I couldn't talk about the grievance even in simple social situations. Now the subject is no longer taboo. In fact, I want people to know what I went through.

* * *

It, perhaps, permanently changed my personality. I am now a bitter, angry, cynical person. Before, I used to describe myself as a basically happy person. I resent deeply the people who did this to me!

* * *

Ironically, the matter has had a positive impact on me physically. It has made me into a marathon runner.

* * *

Legal fees were $5000 and I'm now in a job for which I'm overqualified and underpaid.

* * *

I'm now on tenure. I began for the first time to launch research and teaching projects that I was most interested in, but could not do prior to the grievance.

* * *

I feel more complacent and stable on my job. I have received a substantial salary increase.

* * *

I am energized.

* * *

Psychologically, it made me feel like a better person.

* * *

I feel depressed most of the time. Socially, I feel isolated. My health has deteriorated.

* * *

Felt burdened by great stress - worried about the future. Gave up social life to spend a great deal of time working on my case. Sleeping pattern disturbed.

* * *

The grievance procedure put a tremendous strain on my self confidence and on my relationship with my wife and children. I lost my appetite - lost 30 lbs. and I developed high blood pressure. My research and publication virtually stopped.

* * *

Got divorced.

* * *

I felt bitter toward some people and the system. You are not judged by your work and job description.

* * *

Got book published - tenure - promotion.

* * *

Tremendously energy-consuming, difficult to not perveive self at times as a winner. Generally, a very different experience. Shunned (perhaps

only in my own mind) by some colleagues and friends. Drank more, slept less and usually in a high state of stress.

* * *

Won a large settlement but forced to retire.

* * *

I had 3 grievances and became better at dealing with the feelings of frustration and anger. Became better known professionally.

* * *

I lost my last idealism about universities. I became and remain bitter and cynical. Professionally, it stopped me cold.

* * *

I got psychological help. Fighting with colleagues left bitter feeling. I changed fields.

* * *

Bitter, with less faith than formerly in colleagues, university administrators and in the abil.ty of faculty to create an organization and to make it work.

* * *

Difficult moments during the three years in psychological warfare with men but no permanent damage or bitterness. Delayed promotion diminished my opportunities for professional advancement.

* * *

Busy doing other very exciting and fulfilling things professionally during the grievance.

* * *

I certainly worried. I would reread my work and find myself arguing with my detractors. I often feel they were right and I was worthless. Had no time for social activities. I felt well. Had the support of women faculty, AAUP and a colleague counselor. I devoted less energy to my classes and my writing and research suffered.

* * *

Maintaining a sense of self esteem while going against the grain is never easy. All personal friends were in support. Some dropped the

friendship and a "love relationship" ended as the partner decided I was a loser.

* * *

For over a year I lived with uncertainties. My mood constantly changed from depression to expectation. No time for friends - obsession with my case. Fatigue and tension. Couldn't work productively for over two years.

* * *

I felt too little appreciated but it didn't disturb me too much.

* * *

Mood swings from hope and elation to doubt and despair, worry and anxiety. Stress related ailments - increased blood pressure, irregular heart beat, rashes, frequent colds.

* * *

I am still bitter. I will never be as trusting as I used to be. I cannot shake the sense of being damaged and that permeates everything I do. Colleagues in my field at other universities treat me differently. I think I'm stuck here for life.

* * *

The procedure was over-long (3 years), and frought with sloppy handling by the University. I have suffered a kind of total disillusionment with a school that I entered as a freshman thru Ph.D. and several years of teaching. I got out and am very glad!

* * *

I experienced a whole gamut of feelings from deep shock, disbelief to happiness that the whole thing is over, excepting gaining the experience. I experience lots of detachment with my own colleagues because the social atmosphere was politicized by my grievance against the administration. Even now, I am not completely free from being a cynic. I feel fine at adversity. I believe that I fought a good fight for my profession. I kept my pride and integrity. I have no trouble knowing where I stand and my duties and responsibilities.

* * *

Hearings made me physically ill. Hopes raised and dashed. Became secretive -- didn't want to talk to anyone. Became ill, depressed. Couldn't sleep. My work slowed down.

* * *

> The constant, unwavering support of my colleagues and friends did not permit me to lose heart. But my ego has suffered. Denial of tenure was a shock, a most unpleasant experience, but the actual grievance was less disturbing. I actually gained many new friends because of it. Intestinal problems undoubtedly aggravated by nervous tension. My image as a scholar has suffered.

The appendix includes Tables B1 to B15 with X^2 comparisons of each of the personal and professional cost factors by sex, age and success in the grievance. Nowhere was there a significant difference. It may be of interest to note that the above quotations are grouped by gender.

CONCLUSIONS

Grievants were reached by mail. Unfortunately, the addresses of most of those who had left the University were no longer accurate. The study sample therefore included a disproportionate number of grievants who retained their positions. In this sense, the sample was more likely to include grievants who already had tenure or grievants who had won rather than lost. One might expect that, since most respondents had not lost their jobs or had to change careers, their experience of the process would not be seen too negatively. However, the data show quite the contrary.

First, grieving is a lonely and isolating process that brings little support from colleagues, who usually represent an important source of both personal and professional strength. When this support is not forthcoming, it contributes to the negative impact on the grievant.

Second, most grievants pay a very high price psychologically and professionally, particularly during the grievance process. The trauma often continues afterward for some time, and is manifested by work inhibition, which reinforces the grievants' self doubts as well as fears about being considered inadequate by others.

Further, it is interesting to compare the outcome of grievances filed with EEOC vs. those carried through the internal grievance process. The national study reports that 90% received some relief as compared with this pilot study in which only 53.7% were successful. This would indicate a very significant difference in the chance of success outside the University, though this needs to be clarified in terms of the type of position and resolution.

This study seems to further support the reluctance of women to recognize and confront sex discrimination. With women 46% of the sample only 26.8% claimed minority status as women, although 39.1% identified sex discrimination as an issue in their grievance. In his paper, "The Role of a Male Counselor for Women Grieving Sex Discrimination." B. Kahn reports the special effort required in academia to help the female grievent to recognize the role of sex discrimination in her case, even where it is blatant.

IMPLICATIONS

In an era when sex differences are being identified, analyzed and dissected, there are those who applaud and those who deny the existence of these differences. However, differences in sex role socialization may account in large part for the differential experiences of male and female grievants and their belief in others' support. In this preliminary study, men see stronger support from the faculty organization, probably attesting to influence of the "old boys network". The fact that men in the middle age group differ significantly from others may also reflect this since they have been in the professional setting longer than younger faculty,and may be more active in the "network". But the grievance experience is equally horrendous for both men and women, and their self-esteem.

Fighting for justice and right is never easy. For some, it may be harder to fight for their own position than for abstract principles. The grievance process is difficult and time consuming. It places an extraordinary burden on a grievant taking its toll psychologically, professionally, physically, socially and to a lesser degree, financially. It requires a commitment and dedication to the issues and the principles that, when favorably resolved, help the grievant though they frequently have no impact on the system. Each case must be fought on its own merits and all too frequently, a "win" is achieved through agreement that pledges silence. Each person need therefore laboriously amass information, while the administration is knowledgeable about policies (?) nd procedures.

The grievance process serves a major function in guaranteeing proper implementation of contract stipulations aimed at strengthening institutional evenhandedness. Yet, clearly, it is important to recognize its negative impact on the grievant. An increasing use of third party solutions may be helpful, though the current trend to sending successful grievants back to their departments for re-evaluations serves to make a sham of the process and leads people to wonder whether it is worth enduring the pain.

However, although sex equity is explicit and implicit in the collective bargaining agreements it is also a civil right guaranteed by law. The full strength and force of government is necessary in that guarantee. Women should not be required to use the grievance process with its very high personal and professional cost to eliminate sex discrimination. In the internal process, it would be the rare situation where the administration or a group of colleagues would admit to sex discrimination. Given the strong administration role and peer role in the grievance process, especially in sex discrimination

cases, using the grievance process, is like putting the fox in charge of the chicken coop when it comes to sex equity issues.

Women should be encouraged to take their charges to the experienced assessment of law enforcement units in the State Divisions of Civil Rights or the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission where findings of probable cause are made. Unfortunately, there is good reason to believe should the case require action in the Civil Courts these are also subject to long delays, and with current weakening of the law, women will find increasing difficulty.

The collegial environment turns into adversarial warfare of grievant against administration, with faculty colleagues as pawns. Support of colleagues was noticeably lacking in this study. With the higher ranks in academe predominately male, it is no wonder that sex discrimination determinations are usually made internally. Consciousness raising is a slow process--slow for women but infinitely slower for men. And recognizing discrimination may not mean its eradication.

Further implications arise in the current move of colleges and universities to raise the standards by which reappointment, promotion and tenure decisions are made. But there are subtle differences between how the sexes are treated. These entail bigger loads for women, and less access to support services, thereby making publications more difficult to achieve. Studies have also revealed a tendency to denegrate women's achievements as compared to men's. In this sense, "merit" and "standards" utilized serve as code words for discrimination. Since the explicit outlawing of sex as a factor in employment in higher education, women have been invited in and supposedly asked to compete on the established guide lines. Thus, although many see rising

standards as falling evenly on both men and women, the real impact will be to delay the achievement of sex equity and the redress of generations of sex role stereotyping.

Each institution has an established norm for faculty with regard to reappointment, promotion and tenure. Where sex discrimination patterns operate, women are able to show that men with equal or lower achievement have progressed more rapidly. It would seem that this norm represents an implicit contract setting the expectations of both faculty and institution for gender differential career progress. Obviously, the norm at Harvard is not the same as at Podunk University, yet each has faculty at all ranks. For Podunk to change its standards for women already in the system places them in double jeopardy in that it is a second abrogation of contract. Women in graduate school had to meet higher standards, and have greater difficulty in obtaining appointments, particularly at presitigious institutions. Having achieved the requisite credentials, the rules of the game are then altered to make it impossible for them to remain and progress, or keep them at low salaries for inordinate time, affecting their pensions as well. To redress this through the grievance process is an undue burden on women. It is important that on this issue women stand together to resist the excessive negative impact on sex equity that this change in standards will have. Women faculty increasingly recognize that every case is likely to have overtones of sexism. Women will never eliminate sex inequity if they allow the rules of the game to be changed every time they approach the goal line. They must recognize it for what it is--a deliberate attempt to turn back the clock on the progress of women.

The pilot study reported in this paper is a first step in the examination of the grievance process and its relationship to sex equity. It doesn't fully answer the questions but hopefully it makes a contribution by beginning to bring into the open issues which are too often kept secret.

References

Begin, James P. "Grievance Mechanisms and Faculty Collegiality: The Rutgers Case." Industrial and Labor Relations Review. Vol. 31, No. 3, April 1978.

Brozan, Nadine. "Uncertain Future for Curbs on Sex Bias." New York Times, Nov. 23, 1981.

Cox, Enid. "Equity/Equality of Women Faculty in Schools of Social Work -- A Long Way to Go." Unpublished. Presented to the Council on Social Work Education, Louisville, Ky. Chronicle of Higher Education. 1976, 13, No. 4.

Chronicle of Higher Education. 1976, 13, No. 4.

Davito, Kathleen. Title IX: The Half Full, Half Empty Glass, Fall 1981. National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs. U.S. Gov't. Printing Office, Washington, D.C. (NACWEP);

Dinerman, B. "Sex Discrimination in Academia." Journal of Higher Education, 1971, 42, 253-64.

Divine, Thomas M. "Women in the Academy: Sex Discrimination in University Faculty Hiring and Promotion." Journal of Education, 1976, 5, 429-51.

Ibanez, Richard A. "Sex and the Social Order." Beverly Hills Bar Journal. Sept. 1974.

Lewis, L.S. Scaling the Ivory Tower: Merit and Its Limits in Academic Careers. Baltimore, Md.: John Hopkins University, 1975.

Mazia, Judith and de Ita, Nancy. "Sex Discrimination in Academia: Representing the Female Faculty Plaintiff." Golden Gate University Law Review. Vol. 9, 481. 1978-9.

Rossi, Alice and Calderwood, Ann. (Ed.) Academic Women on the Move. New York: Russell Sage, 1973.

Sandler, Bernice. "Sex Discrimination, Educational Institutions and the Law." Journal of Law and Education, 1973, 2, 613-35.

Sandler, Bernice Resnick, Director, Project on the Status and Education of Women. Association of American Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.

The Equal Employment News. (EEN), Brookline, Mass. Sept. 1980 and Nov. 1980.

Vladeck, J. P. and Young, M. M. "Sex Discrimination in Higher Education: It's not Academic." Women's Rights Law Reporter, 1978, 4, No. 1, 59-78.

Women's Equity Action League Educational and Legal Defense Fund. Facts About Women in Higher Education. 1977.